REMARKS

In the June 9, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8 were pending in the Application. No claims have been amended, cancelled, or added herein. Thus, claims 1-8 remain pending for consideration, which is respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0196787 to Rajan in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0054688 to Jacobs. On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2-4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan in view of Jacobs and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0133461 to Ho et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an Interview in this case on September 18, 2008. During the Interview, the Examiner agreed (see Interview Summary) that the collective packet of Rajan does not include original headers, but rather, strips off the headers (see e.g. Rajan Figure 2 and paragraph 0013, lines 1-11). Accordingly, Applicants submit that Rajan fails to disclose the feature of "forming collective Internet Protocol data packets, **each containing several Internet Protocol data packets** of different communication data streams" as recited by claim 1 (lines 4-5, emphasis added). Applicants submit that neither Jacobs nor Ho et at., taken alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies of Rajan described above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Independent claim 5 recites "forming collective Internet Protocol data packets, each containing several Internet Protocol data packets of different communication data streams" (lines 4-5), and therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above and also recite additional features.

For example, as discussed during the Interview, Applicants submit that Rajan fails to describe "a timer for setting a time interval, with the Internet Protocol data packets of the different communication data streams that occur within the time interval being combined to form a collective Internet Protocol data packet" as recited by claim 8. Specifically, the Office Action refers to Rajan paragraph 0015 as disclosing such a feature. Applicants submit that Rajan merely groups packets based on a particular characteristic, but does not describe grouping packets within a time interval. For example, paragraph 0015, lines 10-15, of Rajan states:

[a]t block 420 and in accordance with the principles of the invention, the node concatenates n received packets that have a common traffic characteristic requiring a delay of less than r milliseconds to form a concatenated packet for transmission.

In other words, Rajan discloses concatenating packets based on a delay requirement. Concatenating packets (e.g. grouping packets) based on a delay requirement, however, does not equate to grouping packets that occur within a particular time interval (e.g. packets arriving between start time x and end time y, irrespective of their delay requirement). Accordingly, Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose the feature of "a timer for setting a time interval, with the Internet Protocol data packets of the different communication data streams that occur within the time interval being combined to form a collective Internet Protocol data packet" as recited by claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the cited art on this additional basis.

In view of the above, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10/9/08

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501